APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,515	06/26/2003	Brett Error	6067-47301	9313

65132   7590   07/22/2010
M.H.K.K.G., P.C. / ADOBE SYSTEMS INCORPORATED
P.O. BOX 398
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER
FRITZ, BRADFORD F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2442	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/22/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent_docketing@intprop.com
ptomhkkg@gmail.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _08 April 2010_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-12, 18-26 and 30-36_ is/are pending in the application.

　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-12, 18-26 and 30-36_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
　　　application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments, filed 4/08/2010, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s)

1-12, 18-23, 25-26, and 30-36 have been fully considered and are persuasive.

Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a

new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Durham (6,330,566), in view of Cui et al.

(6,910,180), hereinafter referred to as Cui, further in view of Farber et al. (6,185,598),

and Albert et al. (2002/0141401).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 3-8, 11-12, 19, 20, 25-26, 34, and 36are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over by Durham (6,330,566), in view of Farber et al. (6,185,598),

hereinafter referred to as Farber, further in view of Albert et al. (2002/0141401),

hereinafter referred to as Albert.

4.   Regarding claims 3 and 19, Durham disclosed a.) receiving a request for a

resource from a requester, the requester having an address (column 7, line 64 – column

8, line 14, Fig. 2); and sending to the requester a redirection request including the new

visitor identifier and an indicator that redirection has already been performed (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), c.2) responsive to determining that the request does not include an indicator that redirection has already been performed: assigning a new visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2); and sending to the requester a redirection request including the new visitor identifier and an indicator that redirection has already been performed (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), the redirection request being adapted to cause the requestor to retransmit the request for the resource (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

However, Durham does not explicitly teach responsive to determining that the request does not include a visitor identifier and responsive to determining that the request does not include a visitor identifier: c.1) determining that the request does not include an indicator that redirection has already been performed, where redirection comprises: assigning a new visitor identifier; assigning a new visitor identifier.

Farber teaches responsive to determining that the request does not include a visitor identifier and responsive to determining that the request does not include a visitor identifier: c.1) determining that the request does not include an indicator that redirection has already been performed (column 16, lines 27-45 and Fig. 3), where redirection comprises: assigning a new visitor identifier (column 16, lines 27-45 and Fig. 3); assigning a new visitor identifier (column 16, lines 27-45 and Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Farber in the combination above because all are from the same field of endeavor and in order to avoid all requests going to the origin server or cause all

requests to go to the repeater causing the repeater to redundantly request resources

which could not be cached (column 16, lines 27-45).

However, the combination does not explicitly teach wherein the indicator that

redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier

Albert teaches wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided

separate from the visitor identifier (paragraphs 0118-0130). It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as

taught by Albert in the combination above because all are from the same field of

endeavor and in order to between dispatched and directed traffic (paragraph 0129).

5.   Regarding claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, and 20 Durham disclosed a method wherein the

visitor identifier comprises a cookie (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

6.   Regarding claim 5, Durham disclosed a method wherein determining whether the

request for the resource included a visitor identifier further comprises the steps of:

comparing the visitor identifier with a range of valid visitor identifiers (column 7, line 64 –

column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 104), and, in response to the visitor identifier being outside

the range of valid visitor identifiers (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item

104), indicating that the request did not include the visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 –

column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 104).

7.   Regarding claim 7, Durham disclosed categorizing data sent with the request for

the resource by at least one selected from the group consisting of a visitor identifier, a

page identifier, and a time stamp (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

8.   Regarding claim 11, Durham disclosed a communication interface for receiving a
request for a resource from a requestor and sending a visitor identifier (column 7, line
64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2); a cookie handler coupled to the communications
interface for performing the steps of: a) determining whether the request includes a
visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), b.1) determining whether
the request includes an indicator that redirection has already been performed (column
7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), where redirection comprises: assigning a new
visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2); and sending to the
requester a redirection request including the new visitor identifier and an indicator that
redirection has already been performed and causing the communication interface to
send to the requestor a redirection request including the new visitor identifier and an
indicator that redirection has already been performed (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line
14, Fig. 2), wherein the indicator that redirection has already been performed is
provided separate from the visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig.
2), the redirection request being adapted to cause the requestor to retransmit the
request for the resource (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2); and a session
controller coupled to the cookie handler for signaling a session end for a particular
visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2); and a repository for:
storing data sent with the request for the resource (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line
14, Fig. 2).

However, Durham does not explicitly teach responsive to determining that the request does not include an indicator that redirection has already been performed: assigning a new visitor identifier.

Farber teaches responsive to determining that the request does not include an indicator that redirection has already been performed: assigning a new visitor identifier (column 16, lines 27-45 and Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Farber in the combination above because all are from the same field of endeavor and in order to avoid all requests going to the origin server or cause all requests to go to the repeater causing the repeater to redundantly request resources which could not be cached (column 16, lines 27-45).

However, the combination does not explicitly teach wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier.

Albert teaches wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier (paragraphs 0118-0130). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Albert in the combination above because all are from the same field of endeavor and in order to between dispatched and directed traffic (paragraph 0129).

9.   Regarding claims 25, Durham disclosed wherein the received request identifies a resource (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), and the redirection request identifies the same resource identified by the received request (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

10.   Regarding claims 26, Durham disclosed wherein the received request identifies

an address (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), and the redirection request

identifies the address identified by the received request (column 7, line 64 – column 8,

line 14, Fig. 2).

11.   Regarding claims 34 and 36, Cui teaches responsive to determining that the

request does include an indicator that redirection has already been performed:

assigning a visitor identifier based on the requestor's address (column 1, lines 57 –

column 2, line 25); determining that the requestor does not accept visitor identifiers

(column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line 25); and causing the communication interface to

transmit the requested resource to the requestor (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line

25).

12.   Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 18, 21-23, 30-33, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over by Durham (6,330,566), in view of Cui et al. (6,910,180),

hereinafter referred to as Cui, in view of Farber et al. (6,185,598), hereinafter referred to

as Farber, further in view of Albert et al. (2002/0141401), hereinafter referred to as

Albert.

13.   Regarding claim 1, Durham disclosed a.) receiving a request for a resource

(column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 100), the request originating at a

client (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 100); b.) determining that the

request for the resource does not include a visitor identifier and does not include an

indicator that redirection has occurred (column 7, lines 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2,

item 102); sending a redirection request with the new visitor identifier to the client, the redirection request comprising an indicator that redirection has occurred (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), and transmitting the requested resource to the client (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

However, Durham does not explicitly teach determining that redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did not store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request; responsive to determining that redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did not store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request, determining that the client does not accept visitor identifiers.

Cui teaches determining that redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did not store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line 25); responsive to determining that redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did not store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line 25), determining that the client does not accept visitor identifiers (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line 25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Cui in Durham because both are from the same field of endeavor and in order to decide whether or not to provide cookie service (column 1, lines 57-65).

However, the combination does not explicitly teach responsive to determining that the request does not include a visitor identifier and does not include an indicator that redirection has occurred: assigning a new visitor identifier.

Farber teaches responsive to determining that the request does not include a visitor identifier and does not include an indicator that redirection has occurred: assigning a new visitor identifier (column 16, lines 27-45 and Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Farber in the combination above because all are from the same field of endeavor and in order to avoid all requests going to the origin server or cause all requests to go to the repeater causing the repeater to redundantly request resources which could not be cached (column 16, lines 27-45).

However, the combination does not explicitly teach wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier,

Albert teaches wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier (paragraphs 0118-0130). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Albert in the combination above because all are from the same field of endeavor and in order to between dispatched and directed traffic (paragraph 0129).

14.   Regarding claim 18, Durham disclosed a.) receiving a request for a resource, the request originating at a client (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2); b.) determining whether the request for the resource includes a visitor identifier and an indicator that redirection has already occurred (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14,

Fig. 2); sending a redirection request with the new visitor identifier to the client (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), the redirection request including an indicator that redirection has occurred (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), and transmitting the requested resource to the client (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

However, Durham does not explicitly teach determining whether redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and whether the client stored the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request; responsive to determining that redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did not store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request determining that the client does not accept visitor identifiers.

Cui teaches determining whether redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and whether the client stored the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line 25); responsive to determining that redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did not store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request determining that the client does not accept visitor identifiers (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line 25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Cui in Durham because both are from the same field of endeavor and in order to decide whether or not to provide cookie service (column 1, lines 57-65).

However, the combination does not explicitly teach c.) responsive to determining that the request does not include a visitor identifier and does not include an indicator that redirection has occurred: assigning a new visitor identifier.

Farber teaches c.) responsive to determining that the request does not include a visitor identifier and does not include an indicator that redirection has occurred: assigning a new visitor identifier (column 16, lines 27-45 and Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Farber in the combination above because all are from the same field of endeavor and in order to avoid all requests going to the origin server or cause all requests to go to the repeater causing the repeater to redundantly request resources which could not be cached (column 16, lines 27-45).

However, the combination does not explicitly teach wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier.

Albert teaches wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier (paragraphs 0118-0130). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Albert in the combination above because all are from the same field of endeavor and in order to between dispatched and directed traffic (paragraph 0129).

15.   Regarding claims2, Durham disclosed a method wherein the visitor identifier comprises a cookie (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

16.   Regarding claim 9, Durham disclosed repeating steps a-d for a predetermined amount of time (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

17.   Regarding claim 10, Durham disclosed repeating steps a-d until receiving a
particular request for a resource (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

18.   Regarding claim 21, Durham disclosed wherein the received request identifies a
resource (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), and the redirection request
identifies the same resource identified by the received request (column 7, line 64 –
column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

19.   Regarding claims 22, Durham disclosed wherein the received request identifies
an address (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), and the redirection request
identifies the address identified by the received request (column 7, line 64 – column 8,
line 14, Fig. 2).

20.   Regarding claim 23, Durham wherein sending a redirection request comprises
sending a redirection request including an indicator that step c) has been performed
(column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

21.   Regarding claims 30 and 31, Durham disclosed repeating steps a-c until
reaching a session expiration (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

22.   Regarding claim 32, Farber disclosed receiving another request for a resource,
the another request originating at a client (column 16, lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-
50, and Fig. 3); determining that the another request for the resource does not include
a visitor identifier and does not include an indicator that redirection has occurred
(column 16, lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-50, and Fig. 3); responsive to determining
that the another request does not include a visitor identifier and does not include an
indicator that redirection has occurred: assigning a new visitor identifier (column 16,

lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-50, and Fig. 3); sending a redirection request with the

new visitor identifier to the client (column 16, lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-50, and

Fig. 3), the redirection request comprising an indicator that redirection has occurred

(column 16, lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-50, and Fig. 3), determining that

redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client

did store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request (column 16, lines 27-

45, column 23, lines 25-50, and Fig. 3); transmitting the requested resource to the client

(column 16, lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-50, and Fig. 3).

However, Farber does not explicitly teach responsive to determining that

redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client

did store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request, determining that the

client does accept visitor identifiers.

Cui teaches responsive to determining that redirection has occurred in

accordance with the redirection request and that the client did store the new visitor

identifier sent with the redirection request, determining that the client does accept visitor

identifiers (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line 25). It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by

Cui in the combination above because both are from the same field of endeavor and in

order to decide whether or not to provide cookie service (column 1, lines 57-65).

However, the combination does not explicitly teach wherein the indicator that

redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier.

Albert teaches wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier (paragraphs 0118-0130). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Albert in the combination above because all are from the same field of endeavor and in order to between dispatched and directed traffic (paragraph 0129).

23.   Regarding claim 33, Farber disclosed d.) receiving another request for a resource from a requestor, the requestor having an address (column 16, lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-50, and Fig. 3); e.) determining that the another request does not include a visitor identifier (column 16, lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-50, and Fig. 3); f.) responsive to determining that the another request does not include a visitor identifier f.1) determining that the another request does include an indicator that redirection has already been performed (column 16, lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-50, and Fig. 3); f.2) responsive to determining that the request does include an indicator that redirection has already been performed: assigning a visitor identifier based on the requestor's address; and transmitting the requested resource to the requestor (column 16, lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-50, and Fig. 3).

However, the combination does not explicitly teach determining that the client does accept visitor identifiers.

Cui teaches determining that the client does accept visitor identifiers (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line 25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Cui in the

combination above because both are from the same field of endeavor and in order to

decide whether or not to provide cookie service (column 1, lines 57-65).

24.   Regarding claim 35, Cui teaches responsive to determining that redirection has

occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did store the new

visitor identifier sent with the redirection request (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line

25), determining that the client does accept visitor identifiers (column 1, lines 57 –

column 2, line 25).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRADFORD F. FRITZ whose telephone number is (571)272-3860. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Philip Lee can be reached on 571-272-3967. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/B. F. F./
Examiner, Art Unit 2442

/Philip C Lee/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2448